



**Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission
Racial and Ethnic Disparities Committee
Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family**

1700 West Washington Street, Suite 230, PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85007

A general meeting of the Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission (AJJC) Racial and Ethnic Disparities Committee was convened April 4, 2019, at the Governor's Office of Youth, Faith and Family, 1700 West Washington Street, Suite 230, Phoenix, Arizona 85007, notice having been duly given.

Members Present (3)	
Helen Gándara, Chair	Alice Bustillo (phone)
Jennifer Ortiz	
Staff/Guests Present (2)	Members Absent (1)
Steve Selover, GOYFF	Earl Newton
Livia Finman, GOYFF Intern	

Call to Order

- **Ms. Helen Gándara**, Chair, called the meeting to order at 10:05am with 3 members and 2 staff present.

Welcome/Introductions

- **Mr. Steve Selover** informed the group Intern **Livia Finman** would be assisting with administration of the meeting and both would be available to support discussion.
- Members present introduced themselves.

Approval of Minutes

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, requested a motion to approve the March 1, 2019, meeting minutes.
 - **Ms. Alice Bustillo** motioned to approve the minutes as drafted.
 - **Ms. Jennifer Ortiz** requested a change in language from Disproportionate Minority Contact (DMC) to Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities (RRED) with regard to the Pinal County Workgroup.
 - **Ms. Bustillo** motioned to approve the minutes contingent upon the change.
 - **Ms. Ortiz** seconded the motion.
 - The motion carried with no dissenting votes.

2018 DMC Conference

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, inquired into the wellbeing of Mr. Earl Newton. She stated the committee would keep Mr. Newton's report on the agenda, until he is present to provide his statement.

RED Reporting & GOYFF Website

- **Mr. Selover** recounted that he previously reviewed the Racial and Ethnic Disparity reporting requirements with the group. He reported receiving very good recommendations for changes, from **Ms. Ortiz**, and that he implemented those changes prior to submitting the final report to the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention (OJJDP). Committee members were provided with a copy of the final data.

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if the committee can self-select the five decision points they wish to address. This was regarding the category listed as “Referral”.
- **Mr. Selover** clarified he chose to use the term “referral” because that is how Arizona facilities report their data. He added that the term is a replacement for what the OJJDP refers to as “arrest”. He stated he can use any term, as long as he provides an explanation.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if there is a difference between total referrals that originate from arrest versus those that do not.
- **Mr. Selover** stated he did not expect the data differentiating arrests versus other types of referrals would be accurate, as it is optional and at the discretion of the person completing the referral form.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if all arrests result from contact with law enforcement. She also asked if decision point data being reported by **Mr. Selover** originates from detention facilities.
- **Mr. Selover** stated data also comes from the juvenile probation departments. He clarified a juvenile may be arrested as a referral from court, but not necessarily detained.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if a referral from court or probation is still considered an arrest.
- **Ms. Ortiz** clarified that whether a referral is by physical or paper arrest, the petition still has to be filed by the county attorney at a later date. She added referrals can also originate from probation violations.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked what other types of referrals are received by the court.
- **Mr. Selover** read the definition of referral as published by the AOC.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked how a parent can petition a referral.
- **Ms. Ortiz** explained Arizona allows parents/caregivers to file “incorrigible” referrals.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, summarized her understanding by stating law enforcement does not account for all referrals. She asked what percentage of referrals comes from law enforcement contact.
- **Ms. Ortiz** explained, when schools issue referrals, the AOC relies on staff to add a note indicating how the referral originated. There is no requirement to do so.
- **Mr. Selover** summarized the information as subjective.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, elaborated on the importance of knowing from where referrals originate as this is what initiatives movement into the system. She asked what role School Resource Officers (SROs) play.
- **Mr. Selover** shared truancy officers may be present on campuses, but do not hold law enforcement authority.
- **Ms. Ortiz** explained the court decides how to proceed on referrals.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, reiterated her point that the committee should be mindful of the “first step” to know from where referrals are coming.
- **Mr. Selover** stated this is especially true with schools, where it is often possible that a referral never should have been made.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, shared that arrest data is regularly associated with law enforcement and it is assumed peace officers are the only source of referral.
- **Ms. Bustillo** expressed disbelief that diversion would not gather data regarding source of referrals.
- **Ms. Ortiz** mentioned it is often difficult to determine if school-based referrals are a school issue or a public issue. She asked how school-based referrals are tracked.
- **Mr. Selover** stated that perhaps the data could be collected at the county level. He added the state does not have a requirement. He added, although referrals are entered into the Juvenile Online Tracking System (JOLTS), how a referral is entered depends on the discretion of the person entering the citation.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, mentioned officers could be asked to track the data.
- **Ms. Ortiz** mentioned the case management system and recommended disaggregating the data.
- **Mr. Selover** mentioned juveniles have the ability to self refer.
- **Ms. Ortiz** clarified that self-referral is the result of a standing warrant, which would already be attached to another referral, with a different point of origination.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, emphasized the need to identify disparities by examining the finer points.
- **Ms. Ortiz** shared that 30% of the referrals in Pima County are school-based.

- **Mr. Selover** stated, to examine racial and ethnic disparities (REDs), the committee should start by looking at data in Pinal County, as they are part of the RED plan that was submitted to the OJJDP.
- **Mr. Selover** then shifted to a discussion of the GOYFF website, regarding the RED/DMC Committee. **Mr. Selover** shared the committee currently does not have a page devoted to data or resources, and that he would like to add one. He restated the OJJDP requirement to post progress reports. He also added the desire to include links and share what is happening in the state related to juvenile justice. **Mr. Selover** referenced the Arizona DMC Assessment which was last published in February 15, 2014.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, redirected the conversation to membership, asking what impact the committee will have while fulfilling the requirements of the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act. She expressed a desire to form a broader work group. **Ms. Gándara** also stated she was in favor of the proposals made by **Mr. Selover**.
- **Mr. Selover** clarified information on the website will be fluid and continually updated. **Ms. Gándara** acknowledged that the issue of DMC has historically been addressed behind closed doors and she feels positive change will come with discussing the issue openly and publically.
- **Ms. Finman** asked **Ms. Gándara** if she was referring to hosting roundtables, as a way to expand the reach of the committee.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, explained she was referring to the need to expand membership strategically.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if the GOYFF has the ability to change the DMC website and if **Mr. Selover** has the authority to change the messaging online.
- **Mr. Selover** stated he will need approval; however, he expected any resistance to changes could be countered by compliance with the OJJDP.

Pinal County's DMC Plan

- **Ms. Ortiz** shared a copy of Pinal County's Reducing Racial and Ethnic Disparities work plan and stated she would be happy to answer any questions.
- **Mr. Selover** reminded the committee the plan helped to inform the compliance report to the OJJDP, which included Arizona's plan for compliance with the JJDP Act. He clarified that the report is more detailed than what was provided to the federal government; however, he wanted each member to have a copy.
- **Ms. Ortiz** shared Pinal County recently hosted a community event in San Tan Valley to introduce community members to police officers. She explained the need for community engagement was identified when the frequency of Stop-and-Talk police interactions exponentially increased to possession or trespassing. She explained neighbors, who were not used to seeing youth of color, were the ones calling in reports. **Ms. Ortiz** reported 1,200 members of the community (kids and families) were in attendance. She reported 25 vendors also participated. A second event is scheduled for May 4, 2019. Because of the success of the event, Pima County plans to host one of their own in June 2019. **Ms. Ortiz** compared this to grassroots outreach closing the gap between law enforcement and the communities they serve.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, observed Pinal County staff must spend a great deal of time looking at referrals.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated they look at who is being detained. She shared, at one point, there were a large number of youth making police contact who lived in group homes. In response, Pinal County and law enforcement met the youth at their homes. For planning the event, the county reportedly used a mapping system to determine the most impactful area to engage the public, which was how they chose the event location.
- **Mr. Selover** commented that an event that size and complex is not easy to put on.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked **Ms. Ortiz** to send the event details to the group. She also commented that Pinal County has been actively involved in the AJJC in a variety of ways over the years.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated the program is well-situated.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked when the next reporting period will be.
- **Mr. Selover** stated the next report to the OJJDP will likely be due on Feb 28, 2020. The report will include both compliance and RED requirements.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, clarified one year after setting goals, the committee will report on its successes. **Ms. Gándara** asked what the group should do with the work plan.

- **Mr. Selover** stated that having the AOC at the table is critical, as Ms. Ortiz is the AJJC's connection to the counties. He indicated the OJJDP expects to see a decline in RED, though no standards have been set.
- **Ms. Ortiz** commented that it will be hard to decrease RED without knowing the source of the issue. She stated, "You can't stop the rain, when you don't know where it's coming from." She recommended meeting with Pinal County leadership, explaining their role in compliance, why they were chosen, and giving them a mission. She shared the steering committee has co-chairs who live in the community, so they are invested.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked how the committee should move forward and how the committee can help further Pinal County's mission. She pointed out the information is going to be reported to the OJJDP, published on the GOYFF website, and showcased as part of the AJJC's efforts.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated county officials can provide RED Committee members with the history of their program and share the impact they have made. She recommended members see for themselves.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked when the committee can do that.
- **Ms. Ortiz** recommended putting the DMC/RED committee on the steering committee agenda of the next meeting.
- **Mr. Selover** suggested coordinating schedules.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated the next steering committee would take place on April 16, 2019 at 9:00 a.m. in the Florence detention center.
- **Mr. Selover** stated that as guests, the DMC/RED would not need quorum.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, clarified members will attend to explain the purpose and role Pinal County is playing in OJJDP compliance and be present to observe the steering committee meeting. **Ms. Gándara** mentioned the possibility of having the steering committee present at an AJJC meeting.
- **Mr. Selover** acknowledged the meeting is only a few weeks away, which may not allow enough time to plan and be added to the agenda.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, realized she would be at the Children of Incarcerated Parents conference in Phoenix.
- **Mr. Selover** suggested **Ms. Gándara** plan to attend the next steering committee meeting, after the conference, as he believes her participation is critical.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, determined the next action item will be to attend the next steering committee meeting in Florence.

DMC Committee Purpose/Scope of Work

- **Mr. Selover** indicated that he wanted to provide the group with an updated version of the scope of work.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated it would be nice to have the scope of work solidified, prior to recruitment of new members.
- **Mr. Selover** reported the name change to the committee still needs to be completed online, as the GOYFF website still reflects the term Disproportionate Minority Contact.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if there are any other changes that need to be made.
- **Mr. Selover** stated that even if other changes are pending, they can be taken care of at a later date. He clarified that because the committee voted on the name change, it stands firm.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, added that as new members are onboarded, the content may change.
- Regarding the area of "Data Collection" **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if the language should be expanded beyond partnering with the AOC. She asked if other agencies should be included. It was agreed broader language was needed.
- Regarding the area of "Effective Representation" **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if the list of stakeholders was exhaustive and if it was guaranteed the committee would partner with the agencies listed.
- **Ms. Ortiz** recommended changing the language to read, "To include, but not limited to."
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated that would mean the committee would have to at least partner with all agencies listed.
- **Mr. Selover** suggested adding the words "Such as" which could mean either/or.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if the committee would partner with the Arizona State Bar. Committee agreed to remove this body.

- **Ms. Ortiz** asked if the Arizona Department of Juvenile Corrections represented “juvenile corrections”.
- **Ms. Bustillo** stated the courts would represent juvenile probation.
- **Mr. Selover** asked if the list should be more specific.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated the list should be generic, but not prescriptive.
- **Mr. Selover** suggested changing the section to state “agencies that work with court-involved youth” and stated he originally was trying to include non-government organizations (NGOs).
- **Ms. Bustillo** asked why the committee wrote the current language as is. She asked if the list of stakeholders could be removed. **Ms. Bustillo** stated as long as there is representation through membership, a detailed list is not needed.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated, after removing the list, the “Effective Representation” portion was now consistent with the rest of the document.
- **Ms. Bustillo** stated she really liked the document.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, shared she could imagine using it in various settings in the future.
- **Ms. Bustillo** added she liked that it was only one page.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, determined that with changes this would be the final draft.

Crosswalk

- **Intern Livia Finman** provided background on the Juvenile Justice Crosswalk created for use by the Arizona Juvenile Justice Commission. A brief overview of the structure and content was provided, along with an explanation for the order of presentation. **Ms. Finman** asked for feedback from committee members.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked what **Ms. Finman** was trying to accomplish through the document. **Ms. Gándara** explained she needed additional context to better identify workgroups that were missing. **Ms. Gándara** clarified that the groups included in the crosswalk represent advisory bodies, not agencies. **Ms. Gándara** asked if the Juvenile Detention Alternatives Initiative (JDAI) statewide steering committee should be included.
- **Ms. Ortiz** explained the steering committee is not a public body and must go through Juvenile Administrative Meeting (JAM) to get approval on JDAI efforts.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, recommended adding the composition of the body, explaining that others may wish to join and want to know how they might get involved. As an example, she asked what parties made up the Committee of Juvenile Courts (COJC).
- **Mr. Selover** clarified that the COJC is made up of the presiding juvenile court judges of each county. **Mr. Selover** stated, for the purpose of the crosswalk, he preferred to keep the composition broad.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated the composition of the body appeared to be equivalent to the “type” as indicated under the section titled Organization Information.
- **Ms. Finman** asked **Ms. Ortiz** if JDAI steering committee should be added to the crosswalk as a subcommittee of the COJC. **Ms. Ortiz**, again, stated that the steering committee provides oversight and is not a subgroup of the COJC.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if other bodies that operate out of the Governor’s Office of Youth, Faith and Family (GOYFF) should be included. As an example, she named The Parents’ Commission.
- **Mr. Selover** shared the Council on Child Safety and Family Empowerment, Arizona Substance Abuse Partnership, and Arizona Human Trafficking Council, which are administered by GOYFF staff, are included in the document.
- **Ms. Finman** shared she had considered other groups, such as the Commission to Prevent Violence Against Women, however no initiatives specific to juveniles had been identified as part of their efforts.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked if the Family Involvement Center (FIC) would be appropriate to add. Processing through her own recommendation, **Ms. Gándara** stated the FIC provides referrals to other resources and is not an advisory body, like the AJJC.
- **Mr. Selover** clarified he would prefer bodies to operate on an equivalent level at the AJJC.

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, added that counties may be more familiar with the agencies that operate within their jurisdictions, and if the AJJC were looking for local partners, it might be more appropriate to connect with county-level agencies. As an example, she referred back to the event held in San Tan Valley, Arizona.
- **Ms. Finman** shared that one criterion for inclusion was whether the body meets publicly.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, suggested creating a cover page to describe the intent of the document and how to use it, to avoid future confusion and miscommunication.
- **Mr. Selover** shared that he would eventually like to put the document online, to make it more accessible and user friendly.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, wished **Ms. Finman** well in her future endeavors.
- **Ms. Gándara** checked the time and agreed to end the meeting at 11:30am.

Membership Expansion

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated that recruitment to the DMC/RED committee can begin by soliciting members at the agencies removed from the scope of work document, such as juvenile corrections, courts, and counties. She recommended discussing community members and asked how many total members should sit on the committee. She suggested 15 or 20 total, including existing membership.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated the committee previously indicated a desire to have 10 members.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, countered that with only 10 members, only 6 would show up.
- **Ms. Ortiz** reminded the group that appointments should be time limited and relevant to the issues being addressed. She cautioned having members join who are not personally interested or involved in the topics being addressed.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked from which agencies the committee could draw that would be most impactful. She expressed a desire to seek out representation from outside of Maricopa County. As examples, she mentioned Yuma County and Pima County, using the term “statewide initiative”.
- **Ms. Ortiz** shared there is a judge in Gila County who consistently seeks out opportunities for diversion. She also mentioned Pinal County Juvenile Court Deputy Director Celena Angstead. In Yuma, they have the HOPE center. And in Pima County, they have the ACES Center.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated Pima County is the benchmark.
- **Ms. Ortiz** also mentioned Angie Lopez, from Pima County, would be a good fit for the committee.
- **Mr. Selover** expressed doubt that the committee has enough substance to recruit members and cautioned that messaging and objectives are clear before taking action.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, countered that it will be through community engagement that the dialog will begin. She stated even that will be significant, as it is not happening now.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated that if the committee reaches out, that will provide the mission. Members have to set the mission as a joint effort. That way, they can determine their scope and bring back to the committee what they have to offer.
- **Mr. Selover** likened the role of the committee to be that of a cheerleader, encouraging engagement and participation.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, stated, “We are the bridge. We will provide the education. They will be really passionate about community engagement and we will support them.”
- **Ms. Bustillo** expressed concern, pointing out that the committee often tries to do “too much” and without “substance” people become turned off. She recommended focusing on the identified goal and maximizing recruitment efforts in support of that goal.
- **Mr. Selover** stated the committee is already connected to Pinal County. Now, the committee needs to connect to counties across the state. Even though they will not be included in OJJDP compliance or looked at as closely, they need to be engaged and learning from one another. He stated the problem is so big and complex that people can become discouraged. Members of the community “have a heartfelt vision” which is why it is important to reach those located farther out, away from the Capitol. **Mr. Selover** went on to say they are “champions of DMC work...they are good at representing and speaking to the issues.”

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, and **Mr. Selover** agreed Arizona Coalition for African American Resources Director **Roy Dawson** could recommend members of his coalition.
- **Mr. Selover** mentioned Florence Crittenton.
- The Children's Action Alliance was discussed.
- **Ms. Ortiz** brought up Goodwill Metro, reminded the committee that it should look like the community. She pointed out that at the southern border, communities are concerned about drugs crossing; in the northern part of Arizona, human trafficking is prevalent.
- **Mr. Selover** mentioned Chicanos Por La Causa and Common Ground.
- **Ms. Ortiz** named Native American Family and Fatherhood Association. She also mentioned the need to reach out to law enforcement.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, recommended having 6 members related to systems, of which the primary membership represents.
- **Mr. Selover** pointed out that **Ms. Ortiz** oversees the whole state and no longer has a counterpart.
- Just this week, **Ms. Ortiz** has traveled to Yuma, Pima, and Gila counties to conduct site visits. She mentioned the AOC is bringing on two new sites this year to the JDAI.
- **Mr. Selover** asked who would contact each entity/potential member.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked to be sent the list.

Next Meeting

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, asked when the next committee and commission meetings would take place.
- **Mr. Selover** reminded the group the AJJC will meet May 2, 2019.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, suggested the committee meet in June and bring the individuals they plan to recruit.
- **Ms. Ortiz** stated the committee will discuss goals, intent, and build a work plan, then debrief in September.
- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, confirmed the committee meeting time for 10:00 a.m. in Conference Room B.
- **Ms. Ortiz** and **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, suggested meeting Thursday, June 13, 2019.

Call to the Public

- **Ms. Gándara**, Chair, made a call to the public. No public was present to answer the call.

Adjournment

- **Ms. Gándara** requested a motion to adjourn.
- **Ms. Ortiz** motioned to adjourn the meeting.
- **Ms. Bustillo** seconded the motion.
 - The motion carried without objection. The meeting was adjourned at 11:34am.

Dated April 4, 2019
AJJC Racial and Ethnic Disparities Committee
Submitted by Livia Finman, GOYFF Intern